



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/967,221	09/28/2001	James Morrow	10407/519	7155

30076 7590 02/17/2004

BROWN RAYSMAN MILLSTEIN FELDER & STEINER, LLP
SUITE 711
1880 CENTURY PARK EAST
LOS ANGELES, CA 90067

EXAMINER

JONES, SCOTT E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3713

15

DATE MAILED: 02/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/967,221

Applicant(s)

MORROW ET AL. *JH*

Examiner

Scott E. Jones

Art Unit

3713

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-138 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-138 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 06 May 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This office action is in response to the amendment and request for continued examination filed on November 18, 2003 in which applicant amends claims 1, 16, 41-43, 68-69, 83-84, 100-102, 114, and 135-138, and responds to the claim rejections. Claims 1-138 are pending.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on November 18, 2003 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-138 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raven et al. (U.S. 5,429,361). Raven et al. discloses a gaming machine information, communication, and display system for automating maintenance, accounting, security, player tracking, event recording, player interaction, and other functions for a plurality of gaming machines. The system has a display and data entry means for a player or employee to interact with the system.

Art Unit: 3713

Furthermore, in addition to gaming functions, the system downloads data from the central data processor to each individual gaming machine. Raven et al. lacks explicitly disclosing:

Regarding Claims 1, 16, 20, 41-43, 68-69, 83-84, 100-102, 114, 118, and 135-138:

- integrating the systems interface display system into the gaming platform screen used to display the gaming information.

Regarding Claims 6, 38, 65, 74, and 98:

- a Y adapter that allows communication between the display screen and both the at least one processor and the additional processor.

Regarding Claims 7, 39, 66, 75, and 99:

- calibration software that enables the additional processor to calibrate the display of system information on the display screen.

Regarding Claims 8, 18, 44, 76, 85, 106, 116:

- the systems interface utilizes touchscreen technology for inputting and accessing system information in the systems network.

Regarding Claims 10, 27, 54, 77, 87, 108, 125:

- the gaming display screen includes a small region that, when selected, activates the system interface.

Regarding Claims 33, 60, 93, and 131:

- the display process that runs the gaming interface supports a graphic user interface based wagering game.

Regarding Claims 36, 63, and 96:

- the converter card utilizes I²C hardware and signaling.

Art Unit: 3713

Regarding Claims 40, 67, and 134:

- integrating the systems interface via the display screen lowers overall system costs due to hardware elimination and reduces maintenance costs due to fewer hardware parts.

Regarding Claims 1, 16, 20, 41, 43, 68, 83-84, 100-102, 114, 118, and 135-138, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention, integrating gameplay and service systems into a single interface display system were well known. It would have been obvious to integrate the systems interface display system into the gaming screen used to display the gaming information. One would be motivated to integrate the gaming and service systems into one display system in order to modernize an existing system to the present state of technology. Furthermore, *In re Larson*, 340 F.2d 965, 968, 144 USPQ 347, 349 (CCPA 1965), the court held that making the use of a one piece construction instead of the structure disclosed in the prior art would be merely a matter of engineering choice. Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of applicant's invention to make Raven's gaming and maintenance interface systems integral on a single platform. One would be motivated to do so because integrating systems is well within known standard engineering guidelines, practices, and principles. See MPEP § 2144.04.

Regarding Claims 6, 38, 65, 74, and 98, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention, utilizing a Y adapter to allow communication to a plurality of devices was well known. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to utilize a Y adapter that allows communication between the display screen and both the at least one processor and the additional processor. One would be motivated

Art Unit: 3713

to utilize a Y adapter to allow communication between the display and one of the processors because a Y adapter provides a simple solution to switching communication from one processor to the other, thereby, allowing the system to eliminate at least one redundant connection between the display and one of the processors.

Regarding Claims 7, 39, 66, 75, and 99, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention, calibration software and hardware for a computer display were notoriously well known in the art.

Regarding Claims 8, 18, 44, 76, 85, 106, 116, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention, touchscreen technology was well known. It would have been obvious to modernize Raven et al. with a systems interface utilizing touchscreen technology for inputting and accessing system information in the systems network. One would be motivated to utilize touchscreen technology in a gaming and servicing system in order to modernize an existing system to the present state of technology.

Regarding Claims 10, 27, 54, 77, 87, 108, 125, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention, providing a gaming display screen including a small region (icon or GUI button) that, when selected, activates the system interface is notoriously well known in the art. One would be motivated to use an icon or GUI button on a display screen to activate a particular system in order to modernize an existing system to the present state of technology.

Regarding Claims 33, 60, 93, and 131, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention, the display process that runs the gaming interface supporting a graphic user interface based wagering game is notoriously well known in the gaming art.

Art Unit: 3713

Regarding Claims 36, 63, and 96, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to use existing engineering guidelines to modernize existing converter card hardware and signaling with I²C hardware and signaling. One would be motivated to do so in order to modernize an existing system to the present state of technology.

Regarding Claims 40, 67, and 134, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention, it would have been obvious that integrating the systems interface via the display screen would lower overall system costs due to hardware elimination and reduce maintenance costs due to fewer hardware parts. Reducing overall costs by eliminating hardware and reducing maintenance costs are a byproduct of modernizing an existing system to the present state of technology.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed November 18, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

6. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection to independent claims 1, 16, 20, 41-43, 68-69, 83-84, 100-102, 114, 118, and 135-138 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raven et al. (U.S. 5,429,361). Applicant alleges Raven et al. does not teach accessing "non-gaming system information from a system network through the gaming platform" using the display screen of the gaming device as claimed. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Please see the rejection to claims 1, 16, 20, 41-43, 68-69, 83-84, 100-102, 114, 118, and 135-138 provided above in item No. 4.

Art Unit: 3713

7. Furthermore regarding claims 1, 16, 20, 41-43, 68-69, 83-84, 100-102, 114, 118, and 135-138, Applicant alleges that the mere positioning of the system display interface near the gaming display interface in Raven's gaming machine is insufficient evidence to produce a prima facie case of obviousness for an invention that claims (amended) a "systems interface [that] displays non-gaming system information from a system network through the gaming platform to a casino player or employee via the gaming display screen of the gaming platform." However, the examiner respectfully disagrees. As discussed above, *In re Larson*, 340 F.2d 965, 968, 144 USPQ 347, 349 (CCPA 1965), the court held that making the use of a one piece construction instead of the structure disclosed in the prior art would be merely a matter of engineering choice. Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of applicant's invention to make Raven's gaming and maintenance interface systems integral on a single platform. One would be motivated to do so because integrating systems is well within known standard engineering guidelines, practices, and principles. See MPEP § 2144.04. Therefore, the examiner believes Raven renders the claimed invention obvious.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Scott E. Jones whose telephone number is (703) 308-7133. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday, 6:30 A.M. - 5:00 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Teresa Walberg can be reached on (703) 308-1327. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3713

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Scott E. Jones
Examiner
Art Unit 3713

sej

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Scott E. Jones". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, stylized "S" and "J".